

### **REMARKS**

Claim 1 has been amended simply in order to clarify the invention. Claims 6, 7, and 9-14 have been withdrawn from further consideration by the Examiner as a result of the election. No new matter has been added. Applicant respectfully requests entry of the amendments and reconsideration of the application in view of the amendments and the following remarks.

#### **Affirmation of Election**

Applicant affirms the provisional election of Group I, Species I, claims 1-5 and 8.

#### **Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1-5 and 8 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Senoo ('061). The Examiner asserts that Senoo teaches the dicing/die bonding film of Claim 1 by referring to Col. 5, lines 40-67 and Col. 6, lines 5-30. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

As clearly can be seen from Fig. 9 of Senoo and the description referred to by the Examiner, Senoo differentiates releasability at area C and at area D. However, C is not a part of the interface between the pressure-sensitive adhesive sheet 11 and the die-bonding adhesive sheet 5.

In contrast, in Claim 1 as amended herein, the interface between the pressure-sensitive adhesive layer (e.g., 2) and the die-bonding adhesive layer (e.g., 3) comprises the interface (A) and the interface (B), and releasability between the pressure-sensitive adhesive layer (e.g., 2) and the die-bonding adhesive layer (e.g., 3) at the interface (A) is higher than the releasability at the interface (B). Senoo does not teach or even suggest the above structure.

Further, in Claim 1, because of the above structure, the pressure-sensitive adhesive layer (e.g., 2) and the die-bonding adhesive layer (e.g., 3) can be securely attached when the dicing of a workpiece is conducted, whereas after the dicing, the die-bonding adhesive layer (e.g., 3) can be released together with the diced workpieces from the pressure-sensitive adhesive layer (e.g., 2). In contrast, Senoo concerns recycling the dicing ring frame, which is irrelevant to Claim 1. Senoo could not achieve the above balanced releasability which can be realized in Claim 1.

In view of the foregoing, Senoo clearly could not anticipate Claim 1 structurally or functionally. The remaining claims depend from Claim 1, and at least for the reason, Senoo also could not anticipate the remaining claims. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection.

**CONCLUSION**

In light of the Applicant's amendments to the claims and the foregoing Remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner have any remaining concerns which might prevent the prompt allowance of the application, the Examiner is respectfully invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number appearing below.

Please charge any additional fees, including any fees for additional extension of time, or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 11-1410.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: March 24, 2005

By: 

Katsuhiro Arai  
Registration No. 43,315  
Attorney of Record  
Customer No. 20,995  
(949) 760-0404